

Serial No. 09/328,417

**REMARKS**

In the Notice of Non-Compliance, mailed 12/20/05, it was said that there was no mention of the continuous feed, multipart .... detachable pin feed edges in the previous claims. The pending claims as submitted were therefore said to be a different invention than the previous claims which were said to be direct to a single envelope. Applicant respectfully traverses and points out that the canceled claims, the specification and drawings as filed, and at least the prior art rejections provided by the previous examiner show a postal envelope system including a multipart business form for creating outgoing and reply envelopes with other pages as described in greater detail below.

To reduce the issues, applicant has proposed that the claim elements related to the "continuous feed, multipart, multilayer form" and "detachable pin feed edges on each side of the form, the form sized to fit a pin feed impart printer" be moved to the body of claim 116.

Applicant respectfully points out that the claims as previously submitted were for the same invention, a postal envelope system having a six ply form producing a top sheet, a message sheet and four other plies producing an outgoing and a reply envelope.

In particular, canceled claim 82 called for a postal envelope system comprising multiple plies that form an outgoing envelope formed from two plies, a reply envelope formed from two other plies, and an originating sheet, i.e. a five part envelope system. Claim 85, dependent on claim 82, added a billing statement as a 6th ply. The envelope system of claims 82 and 85 as claimed was broad enough to cover the use of a multipart pin feed form or a system in which the various materials were glued together as claimed, for example, in the last element of canceled claim 89.

The invention as presently claimed in claim 116, as now amended, is a postal envelope system with 6 plies including a top sheet (I), an outgoing envelope front (II) and back (VI) sheets, a message sheet (III) and a reply envelope front (IV) and back (V) sheets including limitations to the use of a pin feed form sized to fit a pin feed printer as well as other claim details.

The application as filed, entitled "Postal Outgoing and Reply Envelope Form System", clearly teaches a multipart form having 6 plies. See, for example, the unamended first sentence of the

Serial No. 09/328,417

Summary of the Invention on page 4 of the marked up version of the substitute specification which specifies:

" A continuous feed, multipart, multilayer form having detachable pin feed edges on each side sized to fit a pin feed impact printer for producing a postal envelope system is disclosed. Each part of the multipart form may have a top sheet, an outgoing envelope, an information sheet and a reply envelope. A series of coatings may be selectively applied to parts of the multipart form so that information impact printed on top sheet produces an addressed and sealable reply envelope, and an information sheet, removably contained within a sealed and addressed outgoing envelope including a postage permit."

See also Fig. 1 which illustrates the relationship of each of the plies I through VI and the description of Fig. 1, on pages 14 and 15 of the marked up version of the specification, which describes 6 part postal envelope 10, including Parts I though VI from which outgoing envelope 20, reply envelope 30 are made from 4 plies and 2 additional plies are used.

As noted in the Remarks of the previously submitted amendment, the previously cited references Bowen et al ('069) and Ehmlinger ('082) were held to disclose a multiple layer/ply mailer, where the first and second layers/plies are glued together in order to form a useable return envelope, a third layer/ply above the second layer/ply contains the bill/message, a fourth layer/ply above the bill/message layer/ply combined with the first layer/ply forms the outgoing envelope, and a fifth layer/ply above the fourth layer/ply that forms a removable cover sheet. Applicant noted with appreciation the previous examiner's holdings that neither Bowen et al ('069) nor Ehmlinger ('082) disclose the use of two layer/plies to form the outgoing mailer and two other/separate layer/plies to form the return envelope as then claimed.

Further, as noted in the previous amendment, claims 116 – 142 include limitations not taught or rendered obvious in the cited references. Applicant notes that this application appears to have been the subject of rejections on June 24, 2002, December 17, 2002, January 13, 2004 and July 22, 2004 by the previous examiner as well as the current Notice of Non-Compliance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment to avoid requiring the inventor's payment of additional fees, the reconsideration of the

Serial No. 09/328,417

outstanding rejections and the early issuance of this application. Claim 116 may be amended by Examiner's amendment as shown above to facilitate issuance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Norman E. Brunell Reg. #26533/  
Norman E. Brunell, Reg. No. 26,533

**IRELL & MANELLA LLP**  
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4276  
(310) 277-1010  
(310) 203-7199 Facsimile

1464067

- 10 -